


<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 10/665,148	Applicant(s) YAMASAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Sylvia R MacArthur	Art Unit 1763	
	<b>All Participants:</b> (1) <u>Sylvia R MacArthur</u> . (3) _____. (2) <u>Melissa Patrick</u> . (4) _____.		
<b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>15 July 2004</u>		<b>Status of Application:</b> _____	
<b>Type of Interview:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
<b>Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.			
<b>Part I.</b> <b>Rejection(s) discussed:</b> <i>none</i>			
<b>Claims discussed:</b> <i>48 and 49</i>			
<b>Prior art documents discussed:</b> <i>none</i>			
<b>Part II.</b> <b>SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:</b> <i>See Continuation Sheet</i>			
<b>Part III.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)		(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Ms. Patrick that upon review of the preliminary amendment dated 9/22/03 it was noted that all the method claims in the case had been cancelled except for claims 48 and 49. The examiner asked if these claims were to be cancelled as well. Ms. Patricken answered in the affirmative. Thus the claims in the case are all held to an apparatus are claims 1-26..